

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER Executive Director

Division of Oil, Gas and Mining

JOHN R. BAZA
Division Director

July 19, 2013

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT 7011 0110 0001 3568 4985

Jerome Bown Bown Stone Products, Inc PO Box 27 Manti, Utah 84642

Subject: Proposed Assessment for State Cessation Order No. MC-2013-42-02, Bown Stone

Products, Inc, Desert Sienna Mine, S/015/0093, Emery County, Utah

Response Due By: 30 Days of Receipt

Dear Mr. Bown:

The undersigned has been appointed by the Division of Oil, Gas & Mining as the assessment officer for assessing penalties under R647-7.

Enclosed is the proposed civil penalty assessment for the above referenced cessation order. The cessation order was issued by Division inspector, Wayne Western on May 15, 2013. Rule R647-7-103 et. seq. has been utilized to determine the proposed penalty of \$880.00. The enclosed worksheet outlines how the civil penalty was assessed.

By these rules, any written information which was submitted by you or your agent within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this Cessation Order has been considered in determining the facts surrounding the violation and the amount of this penalty.

Under R647-7-106, there are two informal appeal options available to you. You may appeal the 'fact of the violation', the proposed civil penalty, or both. If you wish to informally appeal you should file a written request for an informal conference within thirty 30 days of receipt of this letter.



Page 2 of 2 Jerome Bown S/015/0093 July 19, 2013

The informal conference will be conducted by a Division-appointed conference officer. The informal conference for the fact of the violation is distinct from the informal assessment conference regarding the proposed penalty. If you wish to review both the fact of the violation and proposed penalty assessment, you should file a written request for an assessment conference within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. In this case, the assessment conference will be scheduled immediately following the review of the fact of the violation.

If a timely request for review is not made, the fact of the violation will stand, the proposed penalty will become final, and will be due and payable within thirty (30) days of the date of this proposed assessment (by August 22, 2013). Please remit payment to the Division, mail c/o Sheri Sasaki.

Sincerely,

Lynn Kunzler

Assessment Officer

LK: eb

Enclosure: Proposed assessment worksheet cc: Sheri Sasaki, Accounting

Vickie Southwick, Exec. Sec. P:\GROUPS\MINERALS\WP\M015-Emery\S0150093-DesertSienna\non-compliance\MC-2013-42-01\Pro-Assess-MC-2013-42-02.doc

WORKSHEET FOR ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES DIVISION OF OIL, GAS & MINING Minerals Regulatory Program

	CO #: <u>MC-2</u>	013-42-02 PERM Bown Stone Products, Inc. / Desert Sienna	MIT: S/015/0093			
ASSESS	MENT DAT	TEJuly 19, 2013 TICERLynn Kunzler	- Ville			
	HISTORY (Max. 25 pts.) (R647-7-103.2.11) A. Are there previous violations, which are not pending or vacated, which fall three (3) years of today's date?					
P	PREVIOUS Y	VIOLATIONS EFFECTIVE DATE	POINTS (1pt for NOV 5pts for CO)			
II. <u>S</u>	SERIOUSNESS (Max 45pts) (R647–7-103.2.12) NOTE: For assignment of points in Parts II and III, the following apply: 1. Based on facts supplied by the inspector, the Assessment Officer will determine within each category where the violation falls. 2. Beginning at the mid-point of the category, the Assessment Officer will adjust the points up or down, utilizing the inspector=s and operator=s statements as guiding documents. Is this an EVENT (A) or Administrative (B) violation? Event					
Α		(assign points according to A or B) IT VIOLATIONS (Max 45 pts.) What are the event(s) which the violated state Loss of Reclamation Potential, Conducting approvals. What is the probability of the occurrence of standard was designed to prevent? PROBABILITY POINT None Unlikely	andard was designed to prevent? activities without appropriate			

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 13

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS: The inspector indicated that the event was unlikely to occur, however non payment of the annual permit automatically suspends authority to mine until paid. This did occur. Therefore points were averaged between unlikely (5 pts assessed at midpoint of range) and occurred (20 points) at 13 points.

3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage: <u>Potential damage would</u> result from not having sufficient funds to reclaim the site should the operator default and the Division had to forfeit the surety to reclaim the site

ASSIGN DAMAGE POINTS (RANGE 0-25) 5

In assigning points, consider the duration and extent of said damage or impact, in terms of area and impact on the public or environment.

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS: <u>Since no damage has occurred, and it is</u> unlikely damage would occur, points were assigned at the lower 1/5 of the point range.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE VIOLATIONS (Max 25pts)

1. Is this a POTENTIAL or ACTUAL hindrance to enforcement? _____ Assign points based on the extent to which enforcement is actually or potentially hindered by the violation.

ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS N/A

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A or B) 18

III. <u>DEGREE OF FAULT</u> (Max 30 pts.) (R647-7-103.2.13)

A. IF SO--NO NEGLIGENCE; or, , IF SO--GREATER DEGREE OF FAULT THAN NEGLIGENCE. Point Range No Negligence (Was this an inadvertent violation which was unavoidable by the exercise of reasonable care?)

Negligence (was this a failure of a permittee to prevent the occurrence of a violation due to indifference lack of diligence, or lack of reasonable care?)

Greater Degree of Fault (was this a failure to abate any violation or was economic gain realized by the permittee?

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE Negligent

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 10

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS: The operator was sent a billing statement for the Annual Permit Fees for both 2012 and 2013 – fees were not remitted. The operator was informed of the reclamation surety escalation June 25, 2012 and again on January 28, 2013. This lack of response demonstrates a lack of diligence to willful avoiding the requirements. Points were therefore assigned at the upper 2/3 of the negligence range

IV. GOOD FAITH (Max 20 pts.) (R467-7-103.2.14)

(Either A or B) (Does not apply to violations requiring no abatement measures, or violations not abated at the time of assessment)

Has Violation Been Abated? No

A. EASY ABATEMENT (The operator had onsite, the resources necessary to achieve compliance of the violated standard within the permit area.)

Point Range

	I Ullit Itulia
Immediate Compliance	-11 to -20
(Immediately following the issuance of the NOV)	
Rapid Compliance	-1 to -10
(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation.	
Violation abated in less time than allotted.)	
Normal Compliance	0
(Operator complied within the abatement period required,	
or, Operator requested an extension to abatement time)	

B. DIFFICULT ABATEMENT (The operator did not have the resources at hand to achieve compliance, or the submission of plans was required prior to physical activity to achieve compliance.)

	Point Range -11 to -20
Rapid Compliance	-11 to -20
(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation.	
Violation abated in less time than allotted.)	
Normal Compliance	-1 to -10
(Operator complied within the abatement period)	
Extended Compliance	0
(Operator complied within the abatement period required,	
or, Operator requested an extension to abatement time)	
(Permittee took minimal actions for abatement to stay	
within the limits of the violation, or the plan submitted	
for abatement was incomplete.)	

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT?

ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS ____

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS: <u>Since the violation has yet to be terminated, good faith points cannot be considered for the proposed assessment.</u>

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY (R647-7-103.3)

I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	0
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	18
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	10
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	0
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	
	TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	\$880.00